UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE                                | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|--|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/589,837   | 08/18/2006                                 | Frederic Beun        | MM6019PCT           | 2806             |
| 79681 7590 09/23/2010 David A. Einhorn, Esq. Baker & Hostetler LLP |  |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
|  |  |                      | VAUGHAN, MICHAEL R  |                  |
|  | 45 Rockefeller Plaza<br>New York, NY 10111 |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |  |                      | 2431                |                  |
|  |  |                      |                     |                  |
|  |  |                      | NOTIFICATION DATE   | DELIVERY MODE    |
|  |  |                      | 09/23/2010          | ELECTRONIC       |

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

IPGNY@bakerlaw.com deinhorn@bakerlaw.com Patents-BakerHostetler@bakerlaw.com Application/Control Number: 10/589,837 Page 2

Art Unit: 2431

## **Advisory Action**

The amendments will not be entered because they change the scope of the claims. In view of the arguments, the independent claims have been amended to recite that one or more different external security modules are being paired with a single digital data reception equipment. This feature would need to be further searched and considered. However in the interest of compact prosecution, the claims as amended do not fully support Applicant's alleged difference between cited prior art and the claims. Particularly, the recitation of "one or more" renders the argument of whether or not the prior art teaches pairing multiple cards to a single device moot because the scope covers just a single card pairing to a device. As such, the prior art would only have to teach one security module pairing to one digital data reception equipment in order to read on the claimed subject matter.

Furthermore, the amendment to claim 36 is unclear. It is not understood what the phrase "plurality of access control cards of one or more external security modules". It was thought that access control cards are external security modules. However this phrasing seems to imply the access controls cards somehow contain external security modules. This too is confusing because electronic type cards have *internal* security modules.

/M. R. V./

Examiner, Art Unit 2431